DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 074 CS 505 488

AUTHOR McDowell, Earl E.; McDowell, Carlene E.
TITLE A Study of High School Students' Expectations of the Teaching Style of Male, Female, English and Science Instructors.
PUB DATE 24 May 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (36th, Chicago, IL, May 22-26, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; English Instruction; Females; High Schools; *High School Students; *Interpersonal Communication; Males; Science Instruction; Secondary School Teachers; Self Disclosure (Individuals); Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

A study investigated high school students' expectations of the teaching styles of English, science, male, and female instructors. A sample of 164 high school students completed the Expectation of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire (ETACQ). The same three factors emerged in rating male and English instructors: open, friendly, and dramatic. Female teachers were predominantly labelled attentive, friendly, and dominant. Science teachers were labelled attentive, dramatic, and open. Female high school students rated the friendly dimension significantly higher than did male students for both male and female instructors and rated the open dimension higher for English and science teachers. Male high school students, however, rated the dramatic dimension higher for male, English, and science teachers. Overall, the results of this study reveal that female high school students have higher expectations of teachers from the different categories than male students do. Females expect teachers to be more attentive, show greater sensitivity, show a greater interest in them, and establish closer interpersonal relationships with students. A greater percentage of males, on the other hand, expect a more dramatic communication style, expect to be criticized negatively, and expect the instructor to be impersonal and distant. (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278074

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Study of High School Students' Expectations of the Teaching Style of Male, Female, English and Science Instructors

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl E. McDowell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Earl E. McDowell
Professor
Department of Rhetoric
University of Minnesota

and

Carlene E. McDowell
Language Arts Department
Burnsville Senior High School

International Communication Association
Chicago, IL
May 24, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 505 488

Abstract

This study was designed to assess high school students' expectations of the teaching styles of male, female, English and science instructors. The results indicate that students expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about class-related matters, expect an instructor to enjoy teaching, to demonstrate enthusiasm about course material and to promote class discussion. Specific factors for teaching categories as well as differentiation between male and female students are reported and discussed in the paper.

Much research has been completed on student evaluation of teachers. For example, research by Chickering (1969) concluded that informal interactions with teachers help to develop intellectual and general competence, as well as autonomy and purpose. Other studies by Anderson (1970) and by Hall (1970) attempted to identify what constitutes effective teaching and appropriate methods to measure teaching effectiveness based on informal communication. These studies revealed that teachers who engage in informal communication were perceived as more credible.

Several investigations completed by Pascarella and associates (1976, 1977, 1978a, 1978b) suggest that student faculty interactions extend and reinforce the formal academic experience in fostering students' academic integration. Males tend to focus mostly on academic programs while females focus both on academic programs and socialize informally. The researchers concluded that there was limited intimate disclosure between teachers and students. The interactions between students and teachers help develop higher levels of academic and social integration.

More recently research has focused on teacher immediacy and the communication style of teachers. Research by Andersen (1978) defined a good teacher as one who produces positive outcomes in the affect, behavior and cognitive domains which were termed teaching effectiveness variables. She concluded that significant positive relationships exist

between immediacy variables (nonverbal cues) and affect and behavioral domains. Another study by McDowell, McDowell and Hyerdahl (1981) indicated a relationship between affective communication behaviors and student learning.

Other research used Norton's (1978) Communication Style Instrument to determine the perceived communication styles of teachers. The results of Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum's study (1981) suggest that students who are more immediate have more postive perceptions of their communication styles an have more interpersonal solidarity with students. Students perceive that five styles (e.g., dramatic, open, relaxed, impression leaving and friendly) separate good teachers from better teachers. Other research by McDowell (1984) found college teachers perceive that they use impression leaving, friendly, precise, communicator image and attentive styles most frequently. In contrast, teachers use contentious, dominant open and dramatic styles less frequently than other styles.

Additional research has focused on other descriptive dimensions of teacher behavior. Moskowitz and Hayman (1974) studied praising vs criticizing behavior of teachers. Tuckman and Fabian (1977) studied accepting vs rejecting behavior and warmth and accepting behavior of teachers. Marsh (1977) focused on enthusiasm of teachers. Anderson and Brewer (1980) studied directive vs nondirective behavior of teachers. Overall, these studies concluded that the affective dimension

seems to those behaviors which treat students with respect, listen to students and provide positive feedback on student behaviors. Yoder and Hugenberg (1983) suggested that positive affective style is one in which teachers interact with students on a personal, face-to-face level and demonstrate a tolerance for student opinion. Teachers also should show enthusiasm and have a good sense of humor.

McLaughlin, Erickson, and Ellison (1981) reviewed studies focusing on teacher evaluation. They concluded all evaluation forms have an affective factor. In other research, Rosenfeld (1983) found that students prefer a supportive empathic climate--one in which the teacher understands the students' problems.

More recent research has focused on students' expectations of instructors. Yoder and Hugenberg (1983) concluded that students attending a private university have higher expectations of affective communication behaviors than students in similar courses at a state university. That is, students at a private school indicated an expectation of more personal, one-on-one interaction inside and outside of class and that the instructor will enjoy teaching. Other findings were that males expect closer personal ties with the instructor than females, while females expect the instructor to help them when necessary. Based on the results of the study they suggested further research focusing on students' expectations of teachers from different disciplines.

This study will extend the research of Yoder and Hugenburg. This study is designed to investigate high school students' expectations of teachers from different disciplines, as well as students' expectations of male and female teachers.

Research Questions

1. What are the highest and lowest rated items on the Expectations of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire?
2. Will there be differences between the means of biological sex groups (male and female high school students) in rating male instructors, female instructors, English instructors and science instructors on each item of the Expectations of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire?
3. Will there be differences between the means of biological sex groups (male and female high school students) in rating male instructors, female instructors, English instructors, and science instructors on factors of the Expectations of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire?
4. What are the relationships among factors of male instructors, female instructors, English instructors, and science instructors?

Procedures

A sample of 164 high school students enrolled in sophomore Language Arts classes (68 males and 96 females) completed the Expectation of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire (ETACQ). Students rated male instructors, female instructors, English instructors and science instructors on each item of the questionnaire. A 4 by 4 Latin Square design was used to control for maturation.

Instrument

Yoder and Hugenberg's Expectations of Teacher Affective Communication Questionnaire was used in the study. They indicated that the instrument was generated from previous

questionnaires which measured affective behaviors and perceptions, from concerns identified by organizational climate research and from research on supportive classroom behaviors. The instrument was based on previous literature discussed in this paper. The instrument consisted of 25 likert-type scale items concerning affective communication behaviors. The results of their study indicated that four factors labeled "Enjoys Teaching," "Entertainment," "Role Distance," and "Empathic Closeness" controlled for 84 percent of the variance.

Statistical Analysis

Chi-square analyses, factor analyses, analysis-of-variance and correlational analyses were computed for each of the four sets of data. Initially, chi-square analysis was completed on each item to determine differences between biological sex groups in rating male, female, English and science instructors.

Next, oblique factor analyses were completed to determine what factors would emerge for each teaching category. Since no previous research with high school students had been completed, factor analysis was necessary to determine factors for each teaching category. Based on the results of the factor analyses, one way analyses-of-variance were completed to determine differences between biological sex groups on each factor for each teaching category. Correlational analyses were also completed to determine relationships among factors.

Results

The results, reported in Table 1, indicated that items, 1, 5, 13, 16, and 24 were rated highest for all instructors. In contrast, items 6, 12 and 25 were rated the lowest.

The item by item chi-square analyses revealed that significant differences occurred between groups in rating item 1 and 10 for all teaching categories. Significant differences also occurred between biolgocial sex groups in rating items 5 and 16 for male and female teachers. In all cases female students rated the items higher than the males. Female students also rated item 17 higher for male teachers.

Males, on the other hand, rated items 12, 17, and 19 higher for male instructors and rated items 12 and 19 significantly higher for English instructors. Males also rated item 4 higher for science instructors and item 3 significantly lower for science instructors. (See Table 2) The factor analyses results, reported in Tables 3 through 6, indicated that different items loaded in rating various instructor types.

The same three factors emerged in rating male and English instructors: "Open," "Friendly," and "Dramatic." The factors accounted for 82 and 83 percent of the variance respectively.

In contrast differences exist in rating female and science instructors. For the female instructors, factors were labeled: "Attentive," "Friendly," and Dominant." These three factors accounted for 85 percent of the variance. For science

instructors, the factors were "Attentive," "Dramatic," and "Open." They accounted for 80 percent of the variance.

The analysis of variance results are reported in Table 7. The findings indicate that female high school students rated the "Friendly," dimension significantly higher than male students for both male and female instructors. Female students also rated the "Open" dimension higher for English and science teachers. Male high school students, however, rated the "Dramatic" dimension higher for male, English and science teachers.

The correlational analyses revealed that significant relationships exist between "Open" and "Friendly" dimensions for male teachers, "Attentive" and "Friendly" dimensions for female taechers and "Attentive" and "Open" dimensions for science teachers (See Tables 8 through 11.)

Post Hoc multiple discriminant function analyses were completed for each teacher type entered simultaneously. For male instructors signficance occurred (X^2=14.25; df=2; p<.0008; Canonical R=.60). The discriminant function classified 75 percent of the cases into male and female groups. The "Friendly" and "Dramatic" factors correlated with the discriminant function (r's=.45 and .37) respectively.

Similar results occurred in rating female instructors. Overall, the discriminant analysis had statistical significance (X=6.68; df=2; p<.03); canonical R=.32). The discriminant function classified 61 percent of the cases into male and female groups. The "Attentive" factor correlated with the

discriminant function at .84.

Likewise, significant differences occurred in rating English teachers ($X=20.15$; $df=2$; $p<.0001$; canonical $R=.34$), and 62 percent of male and female high school students were classified correctly. The "Open" and "Dramatic" factors correlated with the discriminant function at .76 and .34 respectively.

The final discriminant analysis produced similar results: ($X=15.91$; $df=2$; $p<.0004$; canonical $R=.36$). The discriminant function classified 66 percent correctly and "Dramatic" and "Open' correlated at .55 and .70 respectively.

Discussion

The item by item results indicate that male and female high school students have similar expectations of different categories of teachers. The highest rated items for each teaching category were

- o I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about class-related matters.
- o I expect an instructor to enjoy teaching.
- o I expect an instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.
- o I expect an instructor to promote class discussion of subject matter and related material.
- o I expect an instructor to want me to succeed.

The results seem to indicate that high school students are most concerned about classroom performance of the teacher. Significant differences exist between groups in rating male

and female instructors on item 1 for all teaching categories, and items 5 and 16 for male and female instructors. In all cases females had higher expectations. In addition, over 50 percent of females feel comfortable to talking with an instructor about personal matters and in talking to an instructor outside of class, while only about 20 percent of males feel comfortable in these situations.

The other item by item percentages and chi-square results indicate that about 15 to 20 percent of males expect teachers to criticize them, to be inflexible, and to be impersonal and distant, while only 5 percent of female students expect these things to occur.

Overall, students have high expectations of affective communication behavior of teachers. The item by item mean results are similar to those of private school students reported in Yoder and Hugenberg's study. In contrast, the results of the present study seem to indicate that females desire closer personal relationships with the instructor than males, while males perceive the teacher more as an authority figure.

An interpretation of the factor analyses results indicates that much variation in rating male, female, English and science teachers. Unlike the results in Yoder and Hugenberg's study, three factors instead of four emerged for each teacher category.

In this study "Open" emerged as the primary factor for both male and English instructors and as a third factor for science instructors. In all cases females rated the factor higher than

males. Data shopping revealed that about 70 percent of female students expect male and English instructors to be open and 60 percent of science instructors to be open. In contrast, about 45 percent of male students expect teachers from these categories to be open.

Male high school students rated the "Dramatic" factor significantly higher than females for male, English and science instructors. Approximately 50 percent of male students expect teachers to be dramatic while 30 percent of females expect them to be dramatic.

Based on the results of this study, if female high school students' expectations are realized, it would enhance learning and social development. That is, females rated the "Open," "Attentive," and "Friendly" factors higher than male students. Overall, female feel more comfortable talking about class related matters and about personal matters. They also expect the instructor to make them feel welcome, to be empathic toward personal problems and to promote one-to-one interaction outside of the class.

Overall, the results of this study reveal that females have higher expectations of teachers from different categories than male high school students. Females expect teachers to be more attentive, show greater sensitivity, show a greater interest in them and establish closer interpersonal relationships with them than male students. A greater percentage of males, on the other hand, expect a more dramatic communication style where the teacher uses

humorous examples, tell jokes and acts foolish. Male students also expect to be criticized negatively, and expect the instructor to be impersonal and distant.

As indicated above the results of this study should be viewed with caution as much within group variance existed in rating each item as well as the factors for each teacher type. The discriminant analyses reveal that about 33 percent of the cases were not classified correctly.

Future research is needed to assess students' expectations of teaching style. Below is a list of possible research questions:

1. Do students with different personality types have different expectations of male and female teachers and teachers of different disciplines?
2. Will students of different educational levels (elementary, junior high, senior high, and college) have different expectations of male and female teachers and teachers of different disciplines?
3. Do students with higher expectations receive higher grades in the course?
4. What is the relationship between expectations and final course evaluations?
5. What are the relationships among expectations of affective behaviors and cognitive factors?

These as well as other questions should be researched to determine the roles that teachers play in social and mental development of students. Self-administered questionnaires, as well as informational interviews could be conducted to answer the above questions.

Teachers perceptions of their affective communication

behaviors might also be explored. For example, do teachers at different educational levels have different expectations of their affective communication behaviors both in-class and outside of class? Do teachers who teach different subjects have different expectations? What are the differences between students' expectations and teachers' expectations?

TABLE 1

Means for Each Item of Demographic Variables

	Items	Demographics M	F	Eng	Sci
1.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about class-related matters.	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
2.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about personal matters.	2.7	3.1	2.7	2.6
3.	I expect an instructor to be friends with me.	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.4
4.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor outside of class.	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
5.	I expect an instructor to enjoy teaching.	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2
6.	I expect an instructor to be displeased when students offer differing views.	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.7
7.	I expect an instructor to use humorous exa to illustrate subject matter.	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.4
8.	I expect an instructor to maintain a rigid distance between the students and the teacher.	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2
9.	I expect an instructor to use personal stories and examples to illustrate subject matter.	3.3	3.3	2.5	2.6
10.	I expect an instructor to tell jokes and/or stories that do not relate to the subject matter.	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.6
11.	I expect an instructor to act foolish in class in order to get students to laugh.	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.1
12.	I expect to be criticized negatively by an instructor in front of class.	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6
13.	I expect an instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
14.	I expect an instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me in class.	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4
15.	I expect an instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me outside of class.	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
16.	I expect an instructor to promote class discussion of subject matter and related material.	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1

Table 1 (continued)

	Item	M	F	Eng	Sci
17.	I expect an instructor to lecture more than lead class discussion during this term.	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.8
18.	I expect an instructor to make me feel welcome when I see her or him in the office.	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
19.	I expect an instructor to be inflexible in administering course policies and requirements.	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5
20.	I expect an instructor to be concerned about my problems.	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.0
21.	I expect an instructor to relate to me on my level.	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8
22.	I expect an instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6
23.	I expect an instructor to be emphatic towards my problems.	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0
24.	I expect an instructor to want me to succeed.	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
25.	I expect an instructor to be impersonal and distant with me.	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1

TABLE 2

Rating Chi-square Results for Demographic Variables

	Items	M	F	Eng	Sci
1.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about class-related matters.	.06	.005	.002	.005
2.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor about personal matters.	.18	.80	.06	.34
3.	I expect an instructor to be friends with me.	.63	.34	.73	.01
4.	I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an instructor outside of class.	.86	.01	.0008	.07
5.	I expect an instructor to enjoy teaching.	.001	.07	.13	.25
6.	I expect an instructor to be displeased when students offer differing views.	.71	.25	.19	.53
7.	I expectan instructor to use humorous examples to illustrate subject matter.	.41	.53	.43	.59
8.	I expect an instructor to maintain a rigid distance between the students and the teacher.	.57	.59	.09	.02
9.	I expect an instructor to use personal stories and examples to illustrate the subject matter.	.50	.02	.05	.80
10.	I expect an instructor to tell jokes and/or stories that do not related to the subject matter.	.04	.03	.04	.03
11.	I expect an instructor to act foolish in order to get students to laugh.	.50	.25	.40	.25
12.	I expect to be criticized negatively by an instructor in front of class.	.007	.12	.01	.12
13.	I expect an instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.	.97	.08	.07	.08
14.	I expect an instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me in class.	.70	.51	.13	.51
15.	I expect an instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me outside of class.	.31	.30	.50	.30
16.	I expect an instructor to promote class discussion of subject matter and related material.	.006	.04	.21	.04
17.	I expect an instructor to lecture more than lead class discussion during this term.	.07	.99	.48	.99

Table 2 (continued)

	Items	M	F	Eng	Sci
18.	I expect an instructor to make me feel welcome when I see her or him in the office.	.94	.48	.08	.48
19.	I expect an instructor to be inflexible in administering course policies and requirements.	.008	.36	.02	.26
20.	I expect an instructor to be concerned about my problems.	.13	.46	.93	.46
21.	I expect an instructor to relate to me on my level.	.26	.76	.69	.76
22.	I expect an instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.	.12	.31	.71	.31
23.	I expect an instructor to be empathic towards my problems.	.43	.19	.78	.19
24.	I expect an instructor to want me to succeed.	.25	.07	.12	.107
25.	I expect an instructor to be impersonal and distant with me.	.32	.49	.15	.49

TABLE 3

Male Factors

Factors	Loadings
Open	
I expect a male instructor to make me feel welcome when I see him in his office.	.66
I expect a male instructor to be concerned about my problems.	.68
I expect a male instructor to relate to me on my level.	.73
I expect a male instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.	.66
I expect a male instructor to be empathic toward my problems.	.70
I expect a male instructor to want me to succeed.	.81
Friendly	
I expect a male instructor to be friendly with me.	.63
I expect to feel comfortable in talking to a male instructor outside of class.	.61
I expect a male instructor to enjoy teaching.	.65
Dramatic	
I expect a male instructor to use humorous examples to illustrate subject matter.	.68
I expect a male instructor to tell jokes, and/or stories that do not relate to the subject matter.	.58
I expect a male instructor to act foolish in order to get students to laugh.	.76

Open controls for 50% of the variance
Friendly controls for 18% of the variance
Dramatic controls for 14% of the variance

TABLE 4

Female Factors

Factors	Loadings
Attentive	
I expect a female instructor to make me feel welcome when I see her in the office.	.68
I expect a female instructor to relate to me on my level.	.69
I expect a female instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.	.70
I expect a female instructor to be empathic towards my problems.	.80
I expect a female instructor to want me to succeed.	.78
Friendly	
I expect to feel comfortable in talking with a female instructor about class-related matters.	.68
I expect to feel comfortable in taling with a instructor about personal matters.	.58
I expect a female instructor to be friends with me.	.60
I expect to feel comfortable in taling with a female instructor outside of class.	.74
I expect a female instructor to enjoy teaching.	.55
I expect a female instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.	.64
I expect a female instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me outside of class.	.61
Dominant	
I expect a female instructor to be displeased when students offer differing views.	.54
I expect a female instructor to maintain a rigid distance between the students and the teacher.	.66
I expect to be criticized negatively by a female by a female instructor in front of class.	.67
I expect a female instructor to be impersonal and distant with me.	.58

Attentive controls for 54% of the variance; Friendly controls for 18% of the variance; and Dominant controls for 13% of the variance.

TABLE 5

English Factors

Factor	Loading
Open	
I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an English instructor about class-related matters.	.78
I expect an English instructor to be friends with me.	.58
I expect to feel comfortable in talking with an English instructor outside of class.	.58
I expect an English instructor to enjoy teaching.	.62
I expect an English instructor to be impersonal and distant with me.	.71
Friendly	
I expect an English instructor to make me feel welcome when I meet him/her in the office.	.61
I expect an English instructor to want me to succeed.	.68
I expect an English instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.	.62
I expect an English instructor to lecture more than lead the class discussion during this term.	.69
I expect an English instructor to be inflexible in administering course policies and requirements.	.68
Dramatic	
I expect an English instructor to tell jokes and/or stories that do not relate to the subject matter.	.94
I expect an English instructor to act foolish in order to get students to laugh.	.88
I expect to be criticized negatively by an English instructor in front of the class.	.64

Open controls for 49% of the variance
Friendly controls for 20% of the variance
Dramatic controls for 14% of the variance

TABLE 6

Science Factors

Factors	Loadings
Attentive	
I expect a science instructor to be concerned about my problems.	.64
I expect a science instructor to relate to me on my level.	.60
I expect a science instructor to desire to assist me on an individual basis.	.62
I expect a science instructor to be emphathic towards my problems.	.61
I expect a science instructor to want me to succeed.	.59
I expect a science instructor to promote one-to-one interaction with me outside of class.	.51
Dramatic	
I expect a science instructor to tell jokes and/or stories that do not relate to the subject matter.	.87
I expect a science instructor to act foolish in class in order to get students to laugh.	.95
I expect to be criticized negatively by a science instructor in fron of the class.	.52
Open	
I expect a science instructor to demonstrate enthusiasm about the course material.	.62
I expect a science instructor to promote class discussion of subject matter and related material.	.72
I expect a science instructor to want me to succeed.	.55
I expect a science instructor to enjoy teaching.	.58

Factor 1 controls for 47% of the variance
Factor 2 controls for 23% of the variance
Factor 3 controls for 10% of the variance

TABLE 7

Means and ANOVA for Factors of Demographics

Factors		Male	Female	P
	Male			
Open		20.56	21.07	.51
Friendly		10.60	11.59	.006
Dramatic		8.93	8.16	.05
	Female			
Attentive		20.96	20.86	.90
Friendly		25.15	26.46	.02
Dominant		10.91	10.76	. 2
	English			
Open		25.90	28.15	.001
Friendly		7.60	7.42	.61
Dramatic		7.01	5.94	.001
	Science			
Attentive		20.43	21.36	.14
Dramatic		6.88	5.95	.003
Open		15.79	17.03	.001

TABLE 8

Correlations Among Male Instructor Factors

DV	Open	Friendly	Dramatic
Open		.42*	.13
Freindly			
Dramatic			.23

*significant at .05 level

TABLE 9

Correlations Among Female Instructor Factors

DV	Attentive	Friendly	Dominant
Attentive		.56*	-.10
Friendly			-.08
Dominant			

*significant at .05 level

TABLE 10

Correlations Among English Instructor Factors

DV	Open	Friendly	Dramatic
Open		-.19	-.15
Friendly			.22
Dramatic			

TABLE 11

Correlations Among Science Instructor Factors

DV	Attentive	Dramatic	Open
Attentive		-.07	.52*
Dramatic			-.25
Open			

*significant at .05 level

References

Andersen, J.F. "Teacher Immediacy as a Predictor of Teaching Effectiveness," paper presented at the International Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA., May, 1979, pp. 1-3.

Andersen, J.F., Norton, R., Nussbaum, J. "Three Investigations Exploring Relationships Between Perceived Teacher Communication Behaviors and Student Learning." Communication Education, 3 (1981), pp. 377-392.

Anderson, G. "Effects of Classroom Social Climate on Individual Learning," American Educational Research Journal," (1970), pp. 135-142.

Anderson H. and Brewer, J.E. "Studies of Teacher's Classroom Personalities I: Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior of Kindergarten Teachers (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1945): McLaughlin et al, 1980.

Chickering, A. Education and Identity, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bas, 1969).

Hall, O. "The Effects of Teacher-Student Congruence upon Student Learning in College Classes," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61 (1970), pp. 205-215.

Marsh, H. "The Validity of Students' Evaluations: Classroom Evaluations of Instructors Independently Nominated as Best and Worst Teachers by Graduating Seniors," American Educational Research Journal, 14 (1977) pp. 744-47.

McDowell, E., McDowell, C. and Hyerdahl, J. "A Study of Teacher Immediacy, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Attentiveness at the Junior High and Senior High Levels," Speech Association of Minnesota Journal, 8 (1981), pp. 17-23.

McDowell, E. "An Exploratory Study of Teachers' Perceptions of Their Communication Style When Interacting With Students," Speech Association of Minnesota Journal, 11 (June, 1984), pp. 14-25.

McLaughlin, M., Erickson, K. and Elliason, M. "A Scale for the Measurement of Teachers' Affective Communication," Communication Education, 29 (1980), pp. 21-32.

Moskowitiz, G. and Hayman, J. "Interaction Patterns of First Year, 'Typical,' and 'Best' Teachers in Inner-City Schools," The Journal of Educational Research, 67 (1974), pp. 224-30.

References (continued)

Norton, R. "Foundation of Communication Style Construct," Human Communication Research, 4 (1978), pp. 99-112.

Pascarella E. and Terenzini, P. "Informal Interaction with Faculty and Freshman Ratings of Academic and Nonacademic Experiences of College,: The Journal of Educational Research, 7 (1976) pp. 33-4.

Pascarella, E. and Terenzini, P. "Patterns of Student-Faculty Informal Interaction Beyond the Classroom and Voluntary Freshman Attrition," Journal of Higher Education, 48 (1977), pp. 540-552.

Pascarella, E. "Student-Faculty Informal Relationships and Freshmen Year Educational Outcomes," The Journal of Educational Research, 71 (1978), pp. 184-89.

Pascarella, E., Terenzini, P. and Hibel, J. "Student-Faculty Interactional Settings and Their Relationship to Predicted Academic Performance," Journal of Higher Education, 49 (1978), pp. 450-463.

Rosenfeld, L. "Communication Climate and Coping Mechanisms in the College Classroom," Communication Education, 32 (1983), pp. 167-74.

Tuckman B. and Fabian, M. "Teaching Styles of Vocational Teachers Judged as More or Less Competent," Journal of Experimental Education, 46 (1977), pp. 5-10.

Yoder, D. and Hugenberg, L. "Student Expectations of Teaching Style in the Basic Speech Communication Course," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1983.